

REMARKS

Prior to entry of this paper, Claims 1-38 were pending. In this paper, Claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 11, 17, 27, 29-32 and 34 are amended. No new matter is added by way of these amendments. For the reasons discussed in detail below, Applicants submit that the pending claims are patentable over the art of record and respectfully request that the Examiner pass this application to issue.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Madnick et al. (US 5913214 hereinafter “Madnick”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not anticipate nor make obvious the limitations of the Applicants’ amended claims.

Madnick discloses data extraction from World Wide Web (WWW) pages (e.g. HTML documents). Madnick’s method comprises converting structured queries into separate commands that at least some types of data sources, such as WWW pages, understand (column 2, lines 36-39). Madnick discloses that such conversion is essential, e.g. at column 9, lines 38-44: “Sub-query 602, however, cannot be issued directly to World Wide Web pages 612, 612’ and 612” because Web pages do not respond to structured queries. Therefore, some **additional processing of the sub-query 602 is necessary** before data can be retrieved from the World Wide Web pages 612, 612’ and 612”.”

In one embodiment in Madnick, this additional processing is provided by a wrapper generator (column 9, lines 45-46). The wrapper generator uses a specification file declared by a data source (e.g. WWW page) to generate the commands necessary to interact with it (column 13, lines 22-24 and 13-14). Data is extracted from the data source “using the specification file” (column 13, line 26).


{S:\08214\1200332-US2\80068420.DOC 1/10/2011 10:05:10 AM}

The above explanation clearly demonstrates that Madnick's method of employing separate commands converted from the query to extract data is substantially different than the claimed database-structured query.

Independent Claim 1 was rejected as being anticipated by Madnick. In response, Claim 1 is amended to clarify the method for the data extraction limitation and further claim a step for providing the extracted data based on the database-structured query directly to a user. Minor amendments are also made to clarify dependent claim 6. Data is extracted from a non-database structured arrangement of data that is retrieved from a web domain (see the Specification e.g. at page 17, lines 7-8) by performing the database-structured query (see the Specification at page 18, lines 2-3 and 24-30, in particular: "[a] pattern may be found when it matches the regular expression defined in a database-structured query request"). Madnick does not disclose or suggest the extracting step as claimed in amended Claim 1 because it does not directly perform the database-structured query generated by a user (instead Madnick employs a request translator, see Fig. 2) to extract data from a non-database structured arrangement of data retrieved from a web domain. Claim 1 is therefore allowable.

Additionally, Claim 1 has been amended to further include the limitation of providing the extracted data directly to the user. (See FIGURE 2, and Specification, page 9, lines 1-16). Clearly, none of the cited references enable the limitation of providing the extracted data directly to the user, e.g., providing the extracted data in a tab delimited file that is directly accessible to the user (See Specification, page 9, lines 1-5).

Independent Claim 11 was also rejected as being anticipated by Madnick. In response, Claim 11 is amended in a similar way to Claim 1. In particular, as currently amended, Claim 11 comprises a data extracting step including "retrieving a non-database structured arrangement of data" and "performing the database-structured query". Also, amended Claim 11 also includes the limitation of providing the extracted data directly to the user. For at least the reasons given above, Madnick does not disclose or suggest these novel and non-obvious limitations. Thus, amended Claim 11 is now allowable.

{S:\08214\1200332-US2\80068420.DOC  }

The above arguments show that amended independent Claims 1 and 11 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, dependent Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 10 and 24, and 12, 13, 15 and 16 are at least allowable for the same reasons as amended Claims 1 and 11, upon which they depend, respectively.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejected Claims 4, 14 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Madnick in view of Hennings et al (US 6763496 hereinafter “Hennings”). However, since dependent Claims 4, and 14 and 25 are at least allowable for the same reasons (given above) as amended independent Claims 1 and 11 upon which they depend respectively, the rejections of these claims are now moot and irrelevant.

The Office Action rejected Claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Madnick in view of Jammes. Claim 8 is amended to remove repetition of “retrieving data” between it and independent Claim 1. Regarding the suggestions in the Office Action, Claims 8 and 9 now refer to “the web domain”, which has antecedent basis in Claim 1 as currently amended.

As explained in previous responses, Jammes relates to regular database searching. The Office Action explains how the query script 1814 is retrieved from a URL 1808 in Jammes. The Office Action therefore implies that the query script corresponds to “retrieved data”. The method of Claim 8 includes “reducing the retrieved data to a region of interest” and “searching the region of interest for the data matching a predetermined regular expression”. These actions are not performed on the retrieved query script in Jammes. Indeed, a query script is usually a tool for initiating searching, not data to be searched itself. Jammes therefore does not disclose or suggest the limitations of “reducing the retrieved data to a region of interest” and “searching the region of interest for the data matching a predetermined regular expression” in current Claim 8. For at least this reason, Claim 8 is allowable.

In any case, since dependent Claims 7-9 are at least allowable for the same reasons (given above) as independent Claim 1 upon which they depend, the rejection of these claims is now moot and irrelevant.

The Office Action rejected Claims 17-23, 26, 27, 28, 30-34, 37-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Madnick in view of Iizuka et al. (US 6424980 hereinafter "Iizuka"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not anticipate nor make obvious the limitations of the Applicants' amended claims.

Independent Claims 17, 27 and 34 are all amended in a similar way to amended Claim 1. In particular, currently amended Claims 17, 27 and 34 all include the limitations of retrieving a non-database structured arrangement of data from a web domain and extracting data by performing the database-structured query upon the retrieved non-database structured arrangement of data. Also, each of amended independent Claims 17, 27, and 34 include the further limitation of providing the extracted data based on the database-structured query directly to the user.

Neither Madnick nor Iizuka discloses or suggests these limitations. For at least the reasons given above in relation to amended Claims 1 and 11, amended Claims 17, 27 and 34 are now allowable.

Accordingly, dependent Claims 18-23 and 26, 28 and 30-33, and 37 and 38 are at least allowable for the same reasons as Claims 17, 27 and 34, upon which they depend, respectively.

The Office Action rejected Claims 29, 35 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Madnick in view of Iizuka and further in view of Hennings. However, since dependent Claims 29, and 35 and 36 are at least allowable for the same reasons (given above) as independent Claims 27 and 34 upon which they depend respectively, the rejection of these claims is now moot and irrelevant.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action rejected Claims 29 and 30 because there was insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the provided web domain address”. In response, Claims 29 and 30 are amended to refer to “a” provided web domain address.

Office Action Suggestions

In response to the respective suggestions made in the Office Action, Claims 31, 27, 32, 17, 8 and 9 are amended. The amendments to Claims 8 and 9 are explained above. Claim 31 is amended to spell out the term HTML. The term “web site” in Claim 27 is amended to “website”. The original term “eXtensible” in Claim 32 is replaced with “Extensible”. Claim 17 now refers to a “database-structured query” where indicated by the Office Action.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: June 26, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
John W. Branch

Registration No.: 41,633
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(206) 262-8900
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant